UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/363,121	07/28/1999	BONG-WOO LEE	35399/DBP/Y3	7750

23363 7590 09/24/2002

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD
SUITE 500
PASADENA, CA 91105

EXAMINER
HAYNES, MACK NELSON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/363,121	Applicant(s) LEE, BONG-WOO2	
	Examiner Mack N. Haynes	Art Unit 2879	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 September 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

M. N. H.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicants arguments were not found to be persuasive. More specifically, the applicants have argued on pgs. 4-5 of the applicants' Response that Jang and Kim disclose the application of a uniform coating to a circular cone portion, and that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings of Jang and Kim as to a circular cone portion with the teachings of Tsuneta et al. as to a rectangular cone portion. More specifically, the applicants have argued that if Jang included a rectangular cone portion, the lining graphite 8 would not be uniformly coated on the inside corners of the rectangular cone portion when coated according to the coating method of taught by Jang. However, the examiner holds that whether or not Jang discloses a circular cone portion or a rectangular cone portion is irrelevant because the examiner relies on the teaching and desirablility of uniformly coating the entire inner surface (including the corners) of the cone portion except for an area that faces the getter. Eventhough Jang discloses an area of the inner surface of the cone portion that is not coated with thegraphite lining, that particular area is not at the corners, and one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would understand that if the getter was not present, that particular area of the surface of the cone portion would be uniformly coated with graphite. More over, the applicants have not provided any evidence, but merely conjectured, that the cone portion of Jang is circular as opposed to rectangular; and furthermore, Figs. 1, 2A and 2B appear to disclose a rectangular cone portion as opposed to a circular cone portion.

With regards to the Kim reference, the applicants have argued that Kim's "uniformly deposited" actually refers to the consistency of the layered mixture of the graphite and two oxides. However, the examiner would like to point out that col. 2, lines 30-52 clearly talks about the problems that can arise when the graphite coatings' thickness varies (and is not uniform) across the inside surface of the cone portion (which includes the corners) such as the voltage applied to the cavity of the CRT cannot uniformly flow across the inside surface of the funnel or cone portion. Thus, it is clear that "uniformly deposited" in Kim is referred to the thickness of the graphite coating across the surface of the cone portion. More over, the applicants have specifically argued Kim discloses a circular cone portion and that even if assuming the Examiner's understanding, the uniform thickness of the grahite layer of Kim's "circular cone portion" would be achieved according to the conventional method which provides uniform coating to the CRT having a circular cone portion, and not a rectangular cone portion. However, as mentioned earlier, the applicants have not provided any evidence, but merely conjectured, that the cone portion of Kim is circular as opposed to rectangular; yet, Fig. 3 discloses the cone portion to be rectangular. In addition, whether or not Kim discloses a rectangular or circular cone portion is irrelevant because Kim is relied upon for the teaching of the desirablility of uniformly coating a graphite coating across the inside surface of a cone portion (which includes the corners).

Finally, the examiner would like to again point out that while the applicants have argued that an inner graphite coating cannot be uniformly applied to the inside corners as it is on the horizontal and vertical walls of a rectangulr cone portion, the applicants' formula as claimed in claims 1 and 2 allows for the possiblity of the grahite coating thickness ratios of the corners to the horizontal sides and the corners to the vertical sides to be 1 or i.e., uniform. And If the applicants' arguments are suggesting that it is not possible to have a uniform thickness throughout the inner surface of the funnel (including the corner junctions as compared to the long and short sides of the funnels), then the applicants would have incorporated a possible thickness ratio of the graphite coating at the corners and long and short sides that would cause the CRT to function undesirably and be contrary to the applicants' disclosure, which would not be commesurate with 35 USC 112-1st paragraph; thus, the applicants' arguments would contradict the applicants' disclosure. The examiner respectfully contends that it is not the applicants' intentions to contradict their disclosure (i.e., the claims and specification); therefore, the examiner contends that it is possible to have a graphite coating of uniform thickness on the corner junctions and long and short sides of the funnel; and that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of Tsuneta et al. and Jang and Kim to produce a CRT that includes a funnel with a graphite coating of uniform thickness at the corner junctions and long and short sides.

MICHAEL H. DAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

M.N. H